DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 321 TM 026 574

AUTHOR Zay, Danielle
TITLE How To Make Research Useful for Schools? The Emergence of Researchers-Practitioners Partnerships through Teacher Education Reform in France.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; *Partnerships in Education; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Researchers; *Teacher Education; Technical Assistance; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *France; *Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maitres

ABSTRACT

In France the creation of Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maitres (IUFMs), university institutes of teacher education, has revived the question of the role of research in teacher education. The IUFM is not part of a university and does not have the same status. It has to negotiate a contract with a university. The importance of research in the practice of IUFMs was studied with emphasis on collaboration between researchers and practitioners. Semi-structured interviews with the directors of the 28 IUFMs, document review, and case studies of 15 IUFMs provided data for a series of monographs (14 in all) about educational research and teacher education in France. All of the IUFMs were created with a research function or structure, and their main research dissemination effort has been the creation of networks for training and exchange. These systems are organized around information, methodological help, and material and financial help. The proliferation of horizontal research networks created by the IUFMs is modifying educational research in the demand they create for information, the relations among producers of research, and research processes. The IUFMs have fostered a high demand for applied educational research and have encouraged new partnerships, new modes of training for research, and new subjects for research. (Contains 60 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UNIVERSITE
CHARLES-DE-GAULLE
LILLE 3

SCIENCES HUMAINES
LETTRES ET ARTS

U.F.R. SCIENCES DE L'EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DANIELLE ZAY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 408 321

HOW TO MAKE RESEARCH USEFUL FOR SCHOOLS ?

The Emergence of Researchers-Practitioners Partnerships through Teacher Education Reform in France

Professor Danielle ZAY

Paper presented at the symposium of Division K :

Relating Research and Practice in Teacher Education : International Perspectives

(Chair : Ken ZEICHNER)

Annual Meeting, AERA (American Educational Research Association) 1997

March 24-28, Chicago

Danielle ZAY
Zay @ univ-Lille 3. fr
Phone and fax : 01-42-27-68-98

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM026574

DOMAINE UNIVERSITAIRE
DU « PONT DE BOIS »
B.P. 149
59653 VILLENEUVE D'ASCQ CEDEX
Standard : Tel : (33) 03.20.41.60.00
Telecopie : Fax : (33) 03.20.91.91.71

U.F.R. SCIENCES DE L'EDUCATION

Bâtiment B
TEL : (33) 03.20.41.64.91 - (33) 03.20.41.62.68
FAX : (33) 03.20.41.62.03

Collaborative work between researchers and practitioners is presently a central issue in the United States according to Schön's *"reflective practitioner"* (1983, 1988) and the emergence of networks such as those of the *"Professional Development Schools"* (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990) and the NNER (*National Network for Educational Renewal*), directed by John I. Goodlad (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988; Goodlad, 1994; Osguthorpe & al. 1995). In 1993, the reform of teacher education in Quebec made partnership compulsory for schools and universities (AQUFOM, 1995). This already existed with *"associate schools"* experiments (Carbonneau & Hétu, 1991) and because there was a tendency for these American theories and movements to spread to the whole of Canada.

In France, the creation of IUFMs (Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres), university institutes of teacher education, has revived the question of the role of research in teacher education since research is what defines the difference between institutions of higher education and others. The challenge was not new; the nascent Institutes have benefited from existing facilities both at the regional and national levels. But, the point was debated and has given rise to much controversy since the 1989 Education Guidance Law which created them.

The reform has brought together on a regional basis in a single "University Institute" the former centers each of which used to prepare one particular kind of teacher (primary and secondary school teachers, academic and vocational teachers) and each of which, "Normal School" or "Pedagogical Center", had a director recruited from the appropriate inspecting corps. After the creation of three experimental IUFMs in 1990-91, one IUFM per education authority or "Academy" was set up from the beginning of the academic year in 1991: twenty eight in mainland France and the overseas territories, the West Indies-Guyana and Reunion Island (Zay, 1992; Zay & Bourdoncle, 1996). The Pacific IUFM was created one year later.

The IUFM is not part of a university and does not have the same status as the latter. It is a *"Public Establishment with an Administrative Character"*. It has to negociate a contract at least with one university of the regional "Academy". Nevertheless, the entry of the university into the field of teacher education (the "U" in IUFM) also includes foundation courses (a subject matter only available at universities) and research (as the foundation of knowledge produced at university). However, that fact gives rise to various questions. Who is entitled to do research ? Those who have the status of researcher or also those who are practitioners ? Is research the best means of educating teachers ? Has it the desired effect ? If it has, how are we able to train practitioners to do research while learning its technique ? Then, we have to analyse what collaborative inquiry between researchers and practitioners consists of.

To answer these questions, I have used my research report funded by a Ministerial Direction on the research policy of the IUFMs during their first two years in existence,1990-92 (Demailly L. & Zay D., dir., 1993).

I have begun by defining the theoretical framework and methodological trends (and how the term "research" itself has to be understood) in our multiple-site longitudinal case study, before setting forth three points :

1 - the origin of the question : the analysis of the historical evolution leading to a collaborative inquiry between researchers and practitioners also hinders future reform efforts. History allows us to understand the present controversies against the background of national traditions, which represents a weightyy heritage.

2 - The means :

- Which research training devices have been created ?
- Under what conditions are they best created and developed?

3 - The results of the IUFM research policies : as far as the profession and the professional corps are concerned ?

The original collaborative research devices produced deserve an accurate account because they can be applied elsewhere and answer the problems pointed out by the Holmes Group: *"the research of education schools disproportionately concerns itself with describing the troubles of the education system as it now operates, rather than exploring new avenues for more fruitful teaching and learning. Universities will have to redirect their investiment in education R&D to take account of long-term applied work on what needs to be done to improve the public schools. Also, they must confront the schism between research and practice."* (Holmes Group, 1995, pp. 11-12).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS : the part played by research networks in teacher training

Our theoretical framework is derived from work in the field of sociology of sciences and techniques about scientific laboratories set up using a double alliance network. One network is the scientific community whose reliability guarantees the authenticity of discoveries; the other is the potential or actual consumer, the social demand which opens up market channels for the laboratory product (Latour, 1987; Latour & Woolgar, 1979).

The initial question by Michel Callon -*"How does research manage to create at the same time new products and their associated demand ?"* (1989, p. 14) - seems very relevant to the case of IUFMs in setting up a research policy. Indeed, the role of research in teacher education is far from recognized. On the contrary, it is a new mission assigned to IUFMs in so far as they have acquired a university status after having previously been only professional training centers, Only about ten per cent of additional appointment have been of a university status.

We might hypothesize that, as with the *"proto-laboratories"* studied by M. Callon's research team, organizational units responsible for research at IUFM would have to mobilize both networks, the scientific community to have their research recognized as valid, and the professional circles and its members to interest teacher educators and teachers in their products.

Then we were led not to focus on what is generally studied - educational research contents - but on a still new problem : the management and organization of educational research to bring forward new contents and new structures in the scientific community with an intent to answer the social demand. From this point of view, we have named our research object ***"Research Service"(RS)***, though this name was not used by the IUFMs but, when there is more than one person responsible for research : "pilot group", "technical aid group", team, center, laboratory.

The name translated the hypothesis according to which *"Research Services"* might be analysed like *"collective human constructs"* (Crozier, Friedberg, 1977) just like **Research and Development Services** in firms, or study services, laboratories, counseling services, that is to say a large working unit mainly dealing in services of an intellectual nature (Gadrey, Gallouj & al, 1992). They meet similar problems as those of vocational training at university and like these, they produce new organizational models appropriate to the specificities of the educational field.

So, the issues of our research offer more interest than a peculiar and fleeting national case study. For instance, Research Services at IUFM share the long-term goal defined by an American organization like the OERI (Office of Educational Research and Improvement) *"First, OERI is establishing customer service as its primary core value"*, making much account of this *"view in Congress and among members of the Board, that much nation's research knowledge is not used in classrooms accross America because potential users of such research were never consulted in its formulation"* (OERI, 1995, pp. 3-4). To fulfill its purpose OERI has chosen such a

strategy as this of the national French IUFM network : *"OERI will emphasize improved coordination (...) accross the research and practice communities so that our products and services better address customer needs for complex and timely information."* (p. 4). Thus OERI works with *"Regional Laboratories"* and brings them findings from other Institutes. Then, as OERI, RS at IUFMs place strong emphasis on *"response to customers"* and *"re-engineering of processes"* (OERI, p. 4) and, like the Holmes Group, they aim to *"build a new set of connections to those they serve"* (Holmes Group, 1995, p. 3).

STUDY METHODS. A TWO-PRONGED APPROACH

We have in part used extensive survey and study : semi-structured individual interviews with all research directors or responsible persons in the twenty eight existing IUFMs in 1991-92 and an historical analysis of the topic : how the idea that research has a part to play in teacher education appeared and developed till the idea of research included practitioners ? Our data sources were official texts, symposiums, reports, daily, administrative and specialized press, as well as books and papers.

But our research object still was not established nor structured. We had to work with organizations in the process of establishing themselves. Then we were compelled to use field "actors" to collect the data as it appeared. So we have chosen an inductive, clinical and comparative method and proceeded through in depth case studies and cross-case analysis. We have followed Harper's *"inductive approach"* (1992) co-constructing both the boundaries and the meaning of our cases with the help of our respondents in the field who also were members of the research team. Over the course of collecting data from each site and discussing the issues through national meetings with site correspondents and external researchers, we began to define our cases as theoretical constructs that coalesce in the course of research. Then we were in a *"constructivist perspective" "co-creating our cases with the help of researchers/respondents in the field"* (Wells & al., 1995, p. 22).

SAMPLE, DATA COLLECT AND ANALYSIS

Following our call to participation by letter to all directors or people in charge of research belonging to the twenty eight existing IUFMs, we began with fifteen sites both in metropolitan and overseas academies, with big-, medium- and small-sized IUFMs. Then our cross-case analysis could draw analytical conclusions that would go beyond the immediate findings in each case and allow us to generalize about the impact of various contexts.

Data were gathered through various investigation procedures : interviews, "in situ" participating observations, document/archival review including programs, internal booklets, adminisration memos, budgets, minutes of meetings of the board of directors and of the "Pedagogic and Scientific Commitee" (CSP : Conseil Scientifique et Pédagogique), conventions and agreements.

All the data thus collected were used to write monographs following a common guidelines, using a standardized grid.

The individual or collective author was a member or a team belonging to the IUFM. The common guidelines to collect data was co-built at the same time both reading the data and reviewing the list of categories for the analysis. The monograph was read and reread by two external readers (a person or a team), belonging or not to an IUFM, for comment and criticism.

Fourteen monographs were written. Thirteen were really of use. To improve the cross-case analysis and check the validity of our investigations and of a typology of the IUFM RS, the information obtained from the case-studies was complemented by data gained from the other IUFMs. Finally, we have systematically carried out participant observations or written accounts analysing national meetings.

Before setting forth the issues of our research with regard to collaborative inquiry, and, to better understand the stakes of the reform, we must proceed to a brief analysis of the historical evolution which led to the emergency of R&D in the educational field, that is to say a kind of organization and/or the products relative to the production of knowledge specifically linked to the mastery of action and to innovation in a productive field.

The links between education research and teacher education. THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION

We can identify two movements, one of which became more pronounced in a second phase. From the sixties to the eighties a certain interpenetration of national and international researchers and policy decision makers boosted the idea of a scientific training linked to research through symposiums (*Le plan Langevin-Wallon*, 1964; *Le colloque de Caen*, 1966; *Le colloque d'Amiens*, 1968; AEERS, 1969), through reports and the creation of ministerial departments or organizations.

1967 saw the creation of :

- ministerial research services,

- a pedagogical research department - the origin of the present National Institute of Pedagogical Research (INRP : Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique),

- the University Educational Sciences departments.

The well-known newspaper *le Monde* called it *"Year 1 of Pedagogical Research"* (De Landsheere, 1986, p. 168).

Two years later the Mathematic Teaching Research Institutes (IREM : Instituts de Recherche sur l'Enseignement des Mathématiques) were created. They are the first university structures to aim at establishing a link between research and teacher education. They work with collaborative inquiry teams including researchers, teacher educators and teachers from primary and secondary schools. Their members constitute the hard core of the University teacher education centers created in 1986, the "CUFEF" (Centres Universitaires de Formation d'Enseignants et de Formateurs) : *"one third of these centers has an IREM, whose determining role in the creation of multidisciplinary teams is mentioned several times"* (ARCUFEF, 1988).

At the same time, applied research has emerged from the professional sets, after the establishment in 1972 of inservice teacher training for primary school teachers in normal schools (Zay, 1983, 1986, 1988) and, since 1982, for junior and senior high school teachers in the MAFPENs (Missions Académiques de Formation des Personnels de l'Education Nationale), which are regional authorities in charge of inservice teacher training for secondary school (Peretti, 1982). Normal schools and MAFPENs both worked in connection with the INRP, which allots research hours to teachers at the secondary education level (that was also the teacher educators status at Normal School).

Since the creation of the MAFPENs, the practitioners, teachers and teacher educators who had so far expressed their claims and protests through their trade unions or during symposiums, found favourable ground to build their own definition of research and the schemes best suited to it by gathering initiatives from other institutions, Universities, Normal Schools, INRP and schools.

In 1983, the Carraz Report backed by the ministry made a report on this evolution.

Thus, the idea of a scientific training of teachers through models derived from the solely recognized university research - *"experimental pedagogy"* and *"psycho-pedagogy"* in the sixties and the seventies or C/PBTE (Competence/Performance Based

Teacher Education) in the USA during the same period - would come into opposition with redefinitions for training and research rooted in practice (Zay, 1983). Some researchers like Gaston Mialaret, in France, or Gilbert de Landsheere, in Belgium, from the AIPELF, (Association Internationale de Pédagogie Expérimentale de Langue Française, 1987), the International association of experimental pedagogy in the French-language, to the AFIRSE (1990), the French-speaking international association of scientific research in education, illustrate this passage from the division between scientific research and *"applied research"* to the idea that there exist several forms of research, equally legitimate, some of which can be founded on an answer to the social needs and be rooted in these needs. This evolution goes along with an international movement expressed in documents from the OCDE (CERI/OCDE, 1978, 1982; OCDE, 1971, 1975, 1976, 1994) and UNESCO (1982), evoking Research and Development and *"research training"*.

Because the IUFMs institutionalized this new conception of research in the preservice training of all teachers, under a more general form than in the MAFPENs and on grounds traditionally reserved to universities as regards secondary education, they were to be at the heart of a debate which aimed to suppress all IUFM-based research, despite of their university calling, as is shown by the Kaspi report of 1993.

The situation in France when the IUFMs were created also explains why they are at the crossroad of conceptions - and controversy - concerning educational research.

Indeed, the educational research field is not a mere assembly of territories, a narrowly partitioned juxtaposition of heterogeneous cultural universes. It works like a *"field in action"* as defined by Bourdieu (1992, p. 200) : it is criss-crossed with symbolic force relations which put groups into partial interdependence. It is structured by individual stances taken on the matter, which owe much to their spokesmen's positions.

This field of action is not confined to the producers who historically emerge at a time when R&D has been institutionnally and economically structured, when interaction between all its component (basic and applied research and instrumental findings) leads to an expanding market for pedagogical goods. The field also includes all the adversaries to R&D, to the part R&D might play in teacher duties. These adversaries come from established institutions regulating professional teacher knowledge : the association of "agrégés" (teachers who have passed the "agrégation"), the boards of examiners for the "agrégation", the most highly reputed competitive exam for teacher recruitment in France, some "General Inspections" (in particular, philosophy), University departments (for instance, Litterature), the Academy of Sciences (Institut de France, 1992), and the Association for Excellence of Teaching and Exams in Recruitment (Association pour la qualité de l'enseignement et des concours de recrutement, 1991), which has started a petition to have IUFMs abolished.

All these institutions (especially those for secondary education who prepare the competitive exams for recruitment at university) are fighting against the "pedagogization" of teacher education that the creation of IUFMs symbolizes.

The Kaspi report (1993) gave rise to the peremptory indictment of IUFMs by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research since July 1993. Only universities are commissioned to do research, IUFMs are not. In 1995, the ministry went back on this position and created a Commitee for educational research coordination in which an IUFM representative sits. But, in fact, this Commitee has just been set up in 1997 and we may wonder whether another change in ministerial policy might not question recent innovations.

What are these innovations brought about by IUFM research policies ? Our research has allowed us to evaluate the issue.

THE CREATION OF COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND TRAINING NETWORKS

All the new Institutes are endowed with a research function or structure. The main innovation brought about by IUFMs has been in setting up networks, in the sense that, on the one hand, people in charge of research consider their role to be the establishment of relations between various research and training authorities, at least between universities and IUFMs, and, on the other hand, they must find some of the means for themselves to operate.

So, we have found, in general, with research services constituting themselves as networks, the establishment of all kinds of heterogeneous groups, "pilot groups", "technical aid groups", "centers", having units in different circles. We have noticed attempts at the regional meetings of staff in various research networks (INRP, the National Institute of Pedagogical Research, University departments, Institutes, centers or laboratories and MAFPEN, the Regional "Missions" for National Education Staff) as well as within the same network (such as the INRP) the trend to substitute local teams for the individually associated teachers. We have discovered through existing sources from surveys, the use of various means of information, the circulation of invitation to tenders, the movement to develop new teams around IUFMs.

Out of a sample of thirteen research services representing about half of the IUFMs in France, nine have either made a survey of the current research works of IUFM staff, or inherited the results of the commission which had prepared the creation of the IUFM. Nine have also sent calls for proposals with an encouragement to create teams which should be collaborative and in several cases this feature is required.

The research policy seems fairly largely contractual. Twenty agreements had been concluded, and four more were planned with universities, laboratories, research institutes and centers, at the time of our investigation (1991-92).

Moreover, several IUFMs had concluded multiple contracts or agreements, suggesting the potential for original development coming from the research services at IUFMs having inter-network federations, national and regional in particular, associating for instance the INRP, the MAFPEN, the regional and local authorities.

We have listed various supporting initiatives in favour of teacher educators, reinforcing the efforts mentioned in the preceeding part. Traces of this kind of system can be found in eleven out of thirteen IUFM mongraphs.

Incentive, help and guidance procedures in collaborative research and training networks

These systems are organized around three main lines : information, methodological help, material and financial help (Demailly L., Zay D., 1994).

1° - Information circulates through **surveys, periodical texts**, IUFM **bulletins, personal letters** sent to teacher educators at IUFMs and to teachers who receive student teachers at schools, **specialized publications** such as journals containing summaries of seminars.

They act as an incentive by showing the existence and diversity of research actions in the field of education, not only locally, but also in France and abroad. The idea is to encourage the staff to participate, in various degrees, by attending a symposium or a seminar or even giving a paper.

In five IUFMs out of thirteen, the **"days of study"** make it possible, thanks to a lighter structure than that of a symposium, to bring the participants together, with a twofold perspective :

- a variety of subjects, which is important for professors who are specializing in a single subject at the university, and

- different categories of specialists which shows that research is not reserved solely for university professors. One IUFM has published a **directory** of educational research in its region while another IUFM was planning to do so.

2° - Methodological help is offered to people who wish to engage in research, through systems destined to render explicit the modes of conception, organization and assessment of research.

The structural systems are **thematic work groups or workshops,** on the professional dissertation, for instance.

The exchange systems mainly cover the organization of seminars, as well as of **symposiums** and **summer sessions** which act as certain seminars, in spite of their occasional nature. They make it possible to familiarize participants with research themes and methods and with the specific form of a symposium paper. They may attract an audience which would not necessarily attend a purely university-type symposium.

IUFMs seem to prefer the practice of **seminars** : they can be found in eight monographs out of thirteen with diverse functions.

Some of them are directly linked to the IUFMs training needs, like the **"seminars on didactic reflection"** while the **"seminars on methodology"** are clearly destined to provide research training. Some of the former may be compared to the workshops between mathematics teachers and researchers described by William E. Bickwel and Rosemary A. Hattrup (1995) through the collaboration of the AFT (American Federation of Teachers) and LRDC (Learning Research and Development Center) of the University of Pittsburgh.

Others like the **"DEA seminars"** ("DEA", Diplôme d'Études Approfondies : In Depth Studies Diploma, the preparatory year for a doctorate) are organized with universities which are the only institutions entitled to deliver that diploma. They have a twofold objective :

- giving training in methodology through contact with researchers who are asked to expatiate on their problematic and their personal approach;

- inciting the trainers who attend these seminars to enrol in qualifying research leading to university titles.

We must emphasize the role of the **call for proposals** in the creation of collaborative research networks drawing together established researchers, teacher educators and practitioners. These calls for proposals also constitute an original means of methodological training, not only by assuming that the existence of a team is necessary, but also, because they include possible approaches to dealing with the proposal themes and a plan of presentation for the research file which makes necessary answers to questions having to do with methodology, hypothesis, planning, internal functioning of the team, a bibliography on the chosen topic and support. They constitute in themselves tools for an initiation to the requirements and rhetoric of scientific research.

The questions that must be answered and the existence of a financial appendix prompt one to think that research depends on specific constraints, **collective norms**, and is not a fanciful, expressive or play activity.

3° - Material help

To promote research, providing support is essential. It is dealt with in almost all monographs, either by mentioning its existence, or regretting its absence. Some researchers mention the reluctance of teachers to participate in collaborative research projects simply because teachers are not alloted time to participate. In this respect, support represents a lever which may appear indispensable to a research policy based upon collaborative team work, as a kind of compensation for the difference of status between teachers and researchers.

It includes four principal forms :

1- **extra hours**, for instance for the staff involved in research groups;

2- **reductions in teaching load** : seven out of thirteen IUFMs have proposed reductions to allow teacher educators to complete their first year of doctoral study or a thesis or other research work, for instance on IUFM projects. In four of them teacher educators benefit from the INRP's support to finish their theses.

3- Various **financial support** can also be granted for participating in symposiums, attending doctoral courses, or attending seminars concerning the IUFM (travelling expenses);

4- **support other than financial** also exists, such as the **help for publication** and for **documentation**.

The guidance and support systems are consistent with three main objectives :

- stimulating personal motivation,

- creating and maintaining formal or informal cooperation networks,

- socializing people to the constraints and requirements of scientific research by providing formally defined transition moments and places between research and professional reflection.

These systems seem to be necessary, on the one hand for the development of research practices among trainers, and on the other hand - and the two phenomena are linked - for the development of the teacher educators' professional competence, rather than to draw them away from this field and entice them to apply for posts in purely academic university training.

Which are the issues of these incentives, help and guidance procedures aiming towards a collaboration between researchers and practitioners to improve teaching practices ?

THE EFFECTS OF A RESEARCH POLICY AIMED AT CREATING A RESEARCHERS-PRACTITIONERS PARTNERSHIP

Consequently, we have noticed **a proliferation of horizontal regional networks, often "in the field"**, which strongly modify research in education, in three ways :

- the channels to formulate demand, the emergence of what may legitimately be set up as a research project,

- the symbolic relations between potential producers of research,

- the process : the people concerned admit that networking modifies the ways teacher educators determine the demands and constraints of their job, the field of knowledge that can be made available for that work. It also influences the ways they see themselves, their work and their skills, their specific role in the training institution, their own ability to organize themselves and their future.

- Institutionnal effects and how they touch people

An initial quantitative effect is **the increase in the number of theses and doctorates (DEA)** prepared by the teacher educators, who have remained as secondary teachers while becoming integrated into the new IUFM structures.

At the end of our surveys some IUFM teams also noticed effects for the users that are the **students associated with workshops and seminars**.

Inside the new structures created by IUFMs, researchers, teacher educators and teachers could may establish relationships with two side effects. Researchers who participate immediately see the practical applications of their research. Practitioners influence the choice of subject matter and ways of conducting research projects in their classroom.

The monographs point out two main effects :

1- the make-up of **collaborative and interdisciplinary teams**, breaking with the academic research tradition;

2- **a shift of research contents** in the proposals from IUFMs toward problems more in harmony with those encountered by the teachers in their classrooms : didactics, teaching and training methods, and instructional technology.

Teachers and teacher educators can familiarize themselves with scientific research criteria required for the selection of projects supported by the IUFM and realize that they are not trivial nor unjustified. Participating in a university research team project they can embrace research criteria for analyzing concrete situations they must face and thus better answer student teachers' questions in the classroom. Indeed, these questions are often about the connections between the experiencial contributions during training periods and a reflection and generalizing these in their professionel dissertation.

- Complying with teachers and trainers requests

The analysis of the history of the regional "Missions", the MAFPENs in charge of the inservice teacher training for secondary education, reveals that the problems linked to the prevailing model of training have led teachers to look for other models than those proposed by teacher educators. There emerges a social claim for a different sort of training which implies an innovative and research-oriented approach. The teachers concerned are voluntary teachers who have already attended many training courses and who reflect on their teaching. They are already "in research" as regards their own practice and wish to "do some research" and compare their respective techniques.

Thus, **training-research groups** were born in all MAFPENs (Altet, 1994, pp. 238-241). They expressed a heuristic desire on the part of teachers for a kind of socio-professional research aiming at the production of formalized knowledge, of tools for analysing existing practices to improve the old ones or build new ones. By taking a stand which kept intuitive and routine practices at a distance, these teacher-researchers developped the skill to adapt themselves to shifting teaching contexts in a period of school crisis. This skill of facing unforeseen events is perceived as more and more necessary. It cannot be learnt from model lessons. This training by means of research falls in with the necessity to build a new teacher professionnalism. It uses a project approach and logic, with co-training teams consisting of trainers-researchers implicated in inquiries or with university researchers as "resource-persons". (Altet, 1994, p. 241).

The testimony we have collected from teachers during IUFM "days of study" or symposiums about research corroborate the fact that the new Institutes have met the same needs as the MAFPENs (IUFM de l'Académie de Lille Nord/Pas de Calais, 1992; IUFM de l'Académie de Versailles, 1992). But they develop their action in ways the MAFPENs could not, because the latter are not higher education institutions linked to a university by any formal agreement. Research services at IUFM have systematized the

MAFPEN initiatives. They have set up more important structures and means, and, above all, they have focused on an objective that the MAFPEN could not have : that is to articulate praxeological research, orientated toward the improvement of action, in accordance with the requirements defining scientific research.

CONCLUSION : STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF A DYNAMIC OF CHANGE

The IUFMs, as the MAFPENs had done before them, have fostered **a high demand for applied research** which tends to be overlooked for lack of institutions ready to recognize it since some of them devote themselves exclusively to teacher education while others devote themselves to academic research.

The problems met by the IUFMs are comparable to the problems of other professionalized university channels in France and abroad (Crespo & Lessard, 1990; Fournier & al., 1988; Haberman, 1971; OCDE, 1975; Zay, 1991). In particular, as many researchers have noted, whatever their country might be, to achieve a purpose of professionalization, the incentive system has to be changed (Crespo & Lessard, 1990). The relative lack of traditional rewards for researchers pushes them away from collaboration with practitioners, since that requires significantly more time (Bickel & Hattrup, 1995).

Yet it also appears at the end of our study that the Research Services have brought some **original solutions which could be useful to others. These aim both at facilitating learning by teacher educators and practitioners of recognized approaches and research tools and at reorienting scientific research toward socially useful contents.**

Judging by the example of the researchers, this type of situation may change the orientation of the university institution and its members. Indeed, our national survey of all the people in charge of research at IUFMs has revealed that, even if all but three of them were university people (most of them were full professors, and when they were not, they were often widely recognized in scientific laboratories), all of them were convinced that it was necessary to institutionalize, including for practitioners, research practices **consistent with the criteria in force in the scientific community, but whose objectives, if not the definition of questions and concepts, are defined with a strong link to social demands.**

This point is particularly emphasized in our study. It seems to be a specific national point perhaps linked to the hostility of the intellectual and scientific community to pedagogical research. The innovators have to legitimize their movement. In the USA, the benefit for school and community is more emphasized (Zay, 1995). This is obvious through the works of the Holmes Group and NNER (Goodlad, 1994; Osguthorpe & al. 1995). William E. Bickel and Rosemary A. Hattrup (1995, p. 57) also quoted that Lytle and Cochran-Smith (1990; 1992) point to the value of *"teacher research"* as *"systematic, intentional inquiry by teachers about their own school and classroom"* (1990, p. 84), and so, as *"a way of generating both **local knowledge** and **public knowledge** about teaching : that is, knowledge developped and used by teachers for themselves and their immediate community as well as knowledge useful to the larger school and university communities"* (1992, p. 450).

The analysis of the means implemented by the IUFMs to link together research and training shows that even if they have used traditional methods to lead trainers toward university research, through incentives to pursue or undertake a DEA and thesis, they have also thrown light on the need to create **specific support structures**, which would not compete with universities, but on the contrary, might achieve something complementary "upstream" by draining off toward research some professionals who so far were not interested in such activity, considering it useless, if not harmful, or else had to make too much effort at the expense of their public or private lives to get involved.

However, the obstacles that can be observed in the working conditions of the IUFMs, as much as the behaviour of their staff or users, incite us to consider these three gains in research policies as fragile : namely **new partnerships, new modes of training to do research, new subjects of research**. The idea of collaborative applied research, involving both university researchers and practitioners, indeed runs counter to established monopolies among the different authorities involved in research, training and administration formalization. This conflictual context, in which the idea of collaborative inquiry in the educational field appears, impedes French teacher education in its evolution toward responding to a social demand for partnership professionalization (Zay, 1994).

The results of the research will be deepened with international perspectives in the Subnetwork F, I am responsible for in TNTEE (Thematic Network in Teacher Education in Europe), on the theme : *Developing a "reflective practice" for the teaching profession and teacher education through partnerships between researchers and practitioners.* We shall begin in 1997-98...

REFERENCES

AEERS (Association d'Etude pour l'Expansion de la Recherche Scientifique) (1968). Recommandations du colloque national d'Amiens "Pour une école nouvelle: la formation des maîtres et la recherche en éducation", *L'Expansion de la recherche scientifique*, numéro spécial, mai 1968.

AEERS (1969). *Pour une école nouvelle. Formation des maîtres et recherche en éducation*, Actes du colloque d'Amiens, mars 1968. Paris: Dunod.

AFIRSE (Association Francophone Internationale de Recherche Scientifique en Education) (1990). *Les nouvelles formes de la recherche en éducation au regard d'une Europe en devenir*, Actes du colloque international francophone, Alençon 24-26 mai 1990. Paris: Matrice ANDSHA.

AIPELF (Association Internationale de Pédagogie Expérimentale de Langue Française) (1987). *Recherche scientifique et formation des enseignants et des formateurs*, Actes du VIème congrès international de l'AIPELF. Université de Caen.

Altet, M. (1994). *La formation professionnelle des enseignants.* Analyse des pratiques et situations pédagogiques. Paris: PUF.

AQUFOM (1995). *L'Université et le milieu scolaire: partenaires en formation des maîtres*, Actes du troisième colloque tenu à l'Université Mc Gill, 19-20 novembre 1993. Montréal (Québec): AQUFOM (Association Québecoise Universitaire en Formation des Maîtres).

ARCUFEF, Assemblée des Responsables des Centres Universitaires de Formation des Enseignants et des Formateurs (1988). *Recherche - Formation - Terrain*, Actes du Colloque de l'ARCUFEF, 2-3 mai 1988 (Sèvres).

Association pour la qualité de l'enseignement et des concours de recrutement (1991). *Main basse sur l'éducation ou les conséquences désastreuses sur les générations futures de la nouvelle formation des maîtres*, Actes du colloque tenu en Sorbonne le 13 avril 1991. Paris: Éditions universitaires.

Bickel, W. E., & Hattrup, R. A. (1995). Teachers and researchers in collaboration: reflections on the process. American Educational Research Journal, 32 (1),35-62.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Réponses*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, Seuil.

Callon, M., dir. (1989). *La science et ses réseaux. Genèse et circulation des faits scientifiques*. Paris: Editions la Découverte / Strasbourg / Conseil de l'Europe, UNESCO.

Carbonneau, M., & Hetu, J-C. (1991). Ecoles associées et formation par la pratique. *Recherche et Formation*, 10, 153-164.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Carraz, R. (1983). *Recherche en éducation et en socialisation de l'enfant.* Paris: La Documentation Française.

CERI, Centre pour la Recherche et l'Innovation dans l'Enseignement (1978). *L'innovation dans la formation en cours de service des enseignants,* Pratique et théorie. OCDE (Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques).

CERI, Centre pour la Recherche et l'Innovation dans l'Enseignement (1982). *La formation en cours de service des enseignants,* Condition du changement à l'école. Paris: OCDE/OECD.

Le colloque d'Amiens (1968). *Éducation et développement,* Les Cahiers de l'enfance, L'École nouvelle française, 37.

Le colloque d'Amiens (1968). *L'Éducation Nationale,* Revue hebdomadaire d'information pédagogique, 18, 48 p.

Le colloque de Caen (1966). *L'Education nationale,* 8O7.

Crespo, M., & Lessard, C. (1990). La recherche en éducation au Québec: politiques, développement et impact. *Éducation comparée,* 43, 121-148.

Crozier, M. & Friedberg, E. (1977). *L'acteur et le système.* Paris: Seuil.

Demailly, L. & Zay, D., dir. (1993). *L'émergence de politiques de recherche dans les IUFM.* Étude de la mise en place d'unités organisationnelles chargées de la recherche au sein des IUFM (septembre 1990-décembre 1992). CLERSE-LASTRÉE URA 345 (Lille I), IFEF (Paris VIII), DRED / IFRESI-CNRS / IUFM Nord-Pas de Calais, multig.

Demailly, L. & Zay, D. (1994). Gestion de la recherche et formation de formateurs et d'enseignants. À quelles conditions institutionnelles la recherche peut-elle être un outil de formation pour un groupe professionnel ? *Recherche et Formation,* 17, 47-64.

Fournier, M. & al. (1988). L'évaluation par les pairs et la définition légitime de la recherche en éducation. *Actes de la recherche en Sciences Sociales,* 7, 47-54

Gadrey, J., Gallouj, C., Gallouj, F., Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F. & Tardoir P. (1992). *Manager le conseil.* Edisciences, Mac Graw Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational Renewal. Better teachers, better schools.* San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers.

Haberman, M. (1971). Twenty three reasons why universities can't educate teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 22, 133-140.

Harper, D. (1992). Small N's and community case studies. In C. Rabin & H. Becker (Eds), *What is a case ? The foundations of social inquiry* (pp. 139-157). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing: Holmes Group Inc.

Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools. Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing: Holmes Group Inc.

Holmes Group (1995). A report of the Holmes Group. *Tomorrow's schools of education.* Press embargo 1/27/95.

Institut de France, Académie des Sciences (1992). *Les IUFM (Instituts universitaires de formation des maîtres).*

IUFM de l'Académie de Lille Nord/Pas de Calais (1992). *Journée d'étude sur la politique de recherche de l'IUFM Nord/Pas de Calais,* Unité de Recherche et Formation de Formateurs, Centre IUFM de Douai, 4 décembre 1992, & DEMAILLY, L. (1992). Pour une réflexion collective sur la conduite de la politique de recherche dans l'IUFM Nord/Pas de Calais (pp. 10-22).

IUFM de l'Académie de Versailles (1992). *La recherche et l'IUFM. Une ambition partagée ?,* Journée de rencontre et de travail avec la participation de M. J. Hébrard, Conseiller spécial du Ministre d'État, Ministre de l'Éducation Nationale et de la Culture, samedi 27 juin 1992.

Kaspi, A. (1993). *Rapport sur les instituts universitaires de formation des maîtres.*

Landsheere, G. de (1986). *La recherche en éducation dans le monde.* Paris: PUF.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action.* Harvard University Press.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory Life : the construction of scientific facts.* Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press.

Lytle, S. L. & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990). Learning from teacher research : A working typology . *Teachers College Record,* 92 (1), 83-103.

Lytle, S. L., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1992). Communities for teacher researcher : Fringe or forefront ?. *American Journal of teacher Education,* 100 (3), 298-324.

OCDE (1971). *Formation, recrutement et utilisation des enseignants dans l'enseignement primaire et secondaire.* Paris: Organisation de Développement et de Coopération Economiques.

OCDE (1975). *Les institutions responsables de la formation des enseignants. Problèmes et tendances nouvelles dans quelques pays européens et en Amérique du Nord.* Paris: OCDE.

OCDE (1976). *Politiques à mener vis-à-vis des enseignants*, Rapport général de la conférence, Paris, 26-29 novembre 1974. Paris: OCDE.

OCDE (1994). *Examens des politiques nationales d'éducation : France*, III - Comment garantir la qualité et la cohérence de l'enseignement dans un système de plus en plus diversifié ? Le cas de la formation des maîtres. multig., 36-57

OERI (Office of Educational Research and Improvement) (1995). *Reinventing the office of educational research and improvement - What it means for the researcher and practitioner communities.* AERA session 6.59, AERA Annual Meeting 1995, San Francisco, april 18-22, multig.

Osguthorpe, R. T., Harris, R. C., Fox Harris, M., & Black, S., eds. (1995). *Partner Schools. Centers for Educational Renewal.* Foreword by John I. Goodlad. San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers.

Peretti, A. de (1982). *La formation des personnels de l'Education Nationale.* Paris: La Documentation Française.

Le plan LANGEVIN-WALLON de réforme de l'enseignement (1964). Compte-rendu du colloque organisé par le Groupe Français d'Education Nouvelle et la Société Française de Pédagogie (G., Mialaret, J., Petite, M., Payan et al.). Paris: PUF.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New-York: Basic Books.

Schön D. A. (1988). *Educating the reflective practitioner : toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass. National Institute of Education.

Sirotnik, K. A. & Goodlad, J. I.., eds., (1988). *School-University Partnerships in Action.* Concepts, cases and concerns. New-York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (1982). La formation des formateurs d'enseignants. *Études et documents d'éducation*, 43.

Wells, A. S., Hirshberg, D., Lipton, M., & Oakes, J. (1995). Bounding the case within its context: a constructivist approach to studying detracking reform. *Educational Researcher*, 24 (5), 18-24.

Zay, D. (1983). L'audio-visuel, facteur d'innovation dans la formation des enseignants ?. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 63, 13-31.

Zay, D. (1986). Quel rôle peut jouer la recherche dans la formation des instituteurs? *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 74, 99-113.

Zay, D. (1988). *La formation des instituteurs.* Paris: Editions Universitaires.

Zay, D. (1991). Formation en institution-formation sur le terrain. In Bourdoncle, R., & Louvet, A.,, eds., *Les tendances nouvelles dans la formation des enseignants : stratégies françaises et expériences étrangères*, Actes de colloque, novembre 1990. Paris: INRP, Recherche et Formation, Département "Politiques, pratiques et acteurs de l'éducation", 131-139.

Zay, D. (1992). Teacher education in France. In Buchberger F., ed., *ATEE - Guide to institutions of teacher education in Europe (AGITE)* . Brussels: ATEE (Association for Teacher Education in Europe), 99 - 117)

Zay, D., dir.(1994). *La formation des enseignants au partenariat.* Une réponse à la demande sociale ? Paris: PUF.

Zay, D. (1995). Goodlad (John I.). - Educational Renewal. Better teachers, better schools. - San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers. - *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 111, 118-120.

Zay, D. & Bourdoncle (1996). - " The French System of Teacher-Education ". In Sander T., Buchberger F., Greaves A. E., Kallos D., eds.- *Teacher Education in Europe.* Évaluation and perspectives, National Reports prepared for a European Evaluation conference under the SIGMA Pilot Project, of the European Commission, held at the Universität Osnabrück, Germany, june 23 and 24, 1995. Osnabrück, 1996, 127-162.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE